

Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452)
Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346)
TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP
One Ferry Building, Suite 355
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 788-8200
Facsimile: (415) 788-8208
Email: staylor@tcolaw.com
Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com

Kenneth A. Gallo (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Joseph J. Simons (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Craig A. Benson (*Pro Hac Vice*)
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1047
Telephone: (202) 223-7300
Facsimile: (202) 223-7420
Email: kgallo@paulweiss.com
Email: jsimons@paulweiss.com
Email: cbenson@paulweiss.com

*Attorneys for Sharp Electronics Corporation and
Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 3:07-5944-SC
Individual Docket No. 13-cv-1173-SC

MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates to:

*Sharp Electronics Corp. et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd.
et al.*, No. 13-cv-01173.

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER RE RESPONSE TO EXPECTED
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

1 Plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company
 2 of America, Inc. (collectively, “Sharp”) and Defendant Technologies Displays Americas LLC (“TDA”) *et*
 3 enter into this Stipulation concerning the matter entitled *Sharp Electronics Corp. et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd. et*
 4 *al.*, No. 13-cv-01173, which was related to *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation*, No. 07-
 5 cv-05944, (the “MDL Proceedings”) by an Order of Judge Samuel Conti on March 26, 2013.

6 SUBJECT TO THE COURT’S APPROVAL, THE PARTIES STIPULATE AND
 7 AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

8 WHEREAS, on March 15, 2013, Sharp filed a complaint in the Northern District of
 9 California alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers, distributors and sellers of CRT and CRT
 10 Products, captioned *Sharp Electronics Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, No. 13-cv-01173 (the “Sharp
 11 Complaint”);

12 WHEREAS, the Sharp Complaint named TDA as a defendant, the first such instance
 13 where TDA has been made a party to any case involving claims related to the MDL Proceedings;

14 WHEREAS, on September 26, 2013, Sharp and TDA entered into a stipulation and
 15 proposed order concerning the schedule for TDA to file an answer or motion to dismiss the Sharp
 16 Complaint and a briefing schedule for any motion to dismiss that TDA filed (Dkt. 55; MDL Dkt. 1957);

17 WHEREAS, on September 26, 2013, the Court granted the order provided in the parties’
 18 stipulation as proposed (Dkt. 57; Dkt. MDL 1961);

19 WHEREAS, while the parties’ stipulation and proposed order was pending before the
 20 Court, the Court issued its order granting Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.’s motion to dismiss the
 21 Sharp Complaint as to Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc., and granting Sharp leave to file an
 22 amended complaint (Dkt. 56; MDL Dkt. 1960);

23 WHEREAS, Sharp intends to file an amended complaint (the “Amended Complaint”);

24 WHEREAS, Sharp and TDA have agreed that they will negotiate a mutually agreeable
 25 response date and briefing schedule for TDA to respond to the Amended Complaint after the Amended
 26 Complaint is filed; and

WHEREAS, Sharp and TDA agree that the Court should vacate its earlier order setting a response date and briefing schedule for TDA with respect to the Sharp Complaint.

NOW, THEREFORE, PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 6-1(b), SHARP AND TECHNOLOGIES DISPLAYS AMERICAS LLC, BY AND THROUGH THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Court's order (Dkt. 57; MDL Dkt. 1961), issued on the parties' stipulation, setting a response date and briefing schedule for TDA with respect to the Sharp Complaint shall be vacated;

2. Promptly after Sharp files its Amended Complaint, counsel for Sharp and counsel for TDA shall confer and negotiate a new date for TDA to respond to the Amended Complaint and dates for briefing in the event that TDA's response to the Amended Complaint is a motion to dismiss, and the parties' agreed response date and briefing schedule shall be submitted by stipulation to this Court for consideration and approval.

Dated: October 4, 2013

By: /s/ Jonathan A. Patchen
Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452)
Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346)
TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP
One Ferry Building, Suite 355
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 788-8200
Facsimile: (415) 788-8208
Email: staylor@tcolaw.com
Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com

Kenneth A. Gallo (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Joseph J. Simons (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Craig A. Benson (*Pro Hac Vice*)
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1047
Telephone: (202) 223-7300
Facsimile: (202) 223-7420

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corp. and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc.

1 By: /s/ Nathan Lane III
2 Nathan Lane III
3 Mark C. Dosker
4 SQUIRE SANDERS (US) LLP
5 275 Battery Street, Suite 2600
6 San Francisco, CA 94111
7 Tel: (415) 954-0200
8 Fax: (415) 393-9887

*Attorney for Defendant Technologies Displays Americas
LLC*

9 Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i), the filer attests that the concurrence in the filing of this document
10 has been obtained from each of the above signatories.

11 Dated: October 4, 2013 /s/ Jonathan A. Patchen

12 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: 10/15, 2013

